SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

11th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XI, No. 3 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 February 15, 1981

Budget Cuts: The Fight's Just Beginning

The capital city continues awash with rumors concerning the fiscal bloodletting that the new Administration has repeatedly vowed. But in terms of the budgetary calendar, the present events are very early, and may well qualify for that category of public relations thrusts and counterthrusts that bear little likeness to what the Congress eventually votes and the President approves.

The latest reports concerning research-related items have it that Director David A. Stockman and his henchmen at the Office of Management and Budget aim to cut $162 million from the National Science Foundation, which would devour the "real" increase that the Carter Administration—with expressions of pride—wrote into the NSF budget that it left behind for fiscal 1982 (which begins next October 1).

Geological Survey Chief Ousted From "Non-Political" Post — Page 8

Along the same lines, the OMB assassins have leaked word that they have targeted the space agency for a $629-million reduction in spending for the tottering space shuttle project, plus cuts in NASA's already frail scientific programs.

Playing the War against Washington for all its media potential, the new Administration—despite pre-inaugural pledges to "hit the ground running"—has actually moved slowly, which has the effect of stretching the suspense. Thus, the first formal statement of what it intends to cut won't be issued until February 18, if the present schedule holds up. And for the research-related items, the detailed list isn't expected until early March. According to a middle-rank science chief who's being kept on from the previous Administration, the budget hit list has been divided into big and little savings possibilities, and science falls into the latter category.

Amid the shock that's been evoked by Stockman's soul-curdling statements of intent, what's easily overlooked is that it's standard for all modern presidents to deify frugality: Lyndon Johnson even doused the lights on the White House grounds, and Jimmy Carter repeatedly insisted that his budgets were fat-free to the point of cruelty. Nonetheless, federal spending has inexorably grown. Some of the growth can be ascribed to political sleight of hand by crafty interests that help themselves to disproportionate shares of the nation's tax revenues. But the great bulk of federal spending is in response to public insistence on, or acceptance of, a federal role in a huge inventory of activities, from basic research to feeding the poor. While it's politically attractive to insist that we'd all be better off with less of that role, and that there's a lot of waste in it, what's evident is that, apart from some egregiously nonsensical cases, the federal presence is reasonably useful and prudently managed. In the case of grants for research, outsiders often look on in wonder at what they perceive to be a grand ripoff. Those nurtured in the customs of science wonder how else would you finance research.

Much abuse is heaped on the federal bureaucracy, and a good deal is deserved, but viewing the performance in recent years of Lockheed, Chrysler, Ford, and, most recently, General Motors, it's plain that blatant incompetence is not confined to the public sector. It's just more visible.

The scenario for the coming budget war has been

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

Down with the Social Sciences: An outfit known as the National Tax-Limitation Committee has responded to the new Administration's call for budget-cutting ideas by advising that "Reducing the National Science Foundation's 'soft science' research budget by 50 percent would save $200 million in 1981." Neat trick, since by the most generous definition, NSF's "soft science" budget for '81 is about $75 million.

The Minor Planet Center of the International Astronomical Union has announced the renaming of Asteroid 1957 XE in honor of William D. McElroy, the UC San Diego biologist and former chancellor there, who was Director of NSF when money was voted for the radio telescope that found it. Previous NSF directors have been similarly honored, and several Antarctic mountains have been named after members of the NSF Board.

Nuclear enthusiast Mike McCormack, defeated for re-election to the House from his Hanford, Washington, district, left behind an astonishing item: A newly published report, prepared by the staff of his energy subcommittee, which contends that the Department of Energy serves as a hotbed of anti-nuclear, pro-solar propaganda.

. . .Curious Delays in Filling R&D Jobs

(Continued from page 1)

foreshadowed by the sudden, and effective, counter-attack that Secretary of State Haig shrewdly mounted against Stockman's $2-billion designs on the $8-billion foreign aid budget. Haig, who was tutored in leaking by the grand master, Kissinger, rallied the foreign and domestic constituencies of foreign aid by spreading the Stockman plan all over the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post.* At last word, the cuts were being seriously reconsidered.

The lack so far of a similar preemptive attack by the research community and its close allies in higher education is, in part, attributable to the fact that details of OMB's cutback plans for R&D are just beginning to come out. But more fundamental is that the federal R&D jobs that would normally be the rallying points for fighting back are by and large still vacant or, if filled, it's with officials who, by choice or circumstances, are not inclined to combativeness. This pattern of appointments, and delayed appointments, has a deliberateness to it that's only now becoming apparent.

The White House science office, traditionally the command post for R&D budget wars, is being kept warm by a politically unplugged skeleton holdover crew from the departed Administration. Reports continue to be heard that the choice for Presidential Science Adviser is Simon Ramo, the TRW Inc. engineer-conglomerator. But Ramo's appointment is said to be held up by the complexities of arranging his financial affairs to avoid conflict of interest between the Science Adviser's role and his company, which is a major government contractor. But if they wanted him badly enough, the problem could be solved. Most of the other major posts in the federal research and higher education hierarchy remain vacant. Exceptions include the Department of Education, whose Secretary, Terrel H. Bell, might be expected to fight for his budget, except that he signed on with the understanding that Mr. Reagan wants him to preside over the disappearance of that organization.

John Slaughter and Donald Langenberg, Director and Deputy Director, respectively, of the National Science Foundation, are poorly situated to fight for their budgets within the Administration. Both were appointed in the waning days of the Carter Administration, and then were graciously accepted by the incoming Reaganites, presumably as evidence of the new Administration's intention to take the high road and exempt science from political intrusions. The effect, of course, is to neutralize the NSF leadership, a condition that's reinforced by the absence of a White House science adviser—traditionally NSF's link to politics—and the fact Slaughter and Langenberg don't know any of the important operators in the Reagan camp. NSF is supposed to derive some political strength from the blue-chip mandarins who sit on the National Science Board, its so-called policymaking body. The Board, chaired by Lewis Branscomb, Chief Scientist of IBM, is, however, merely a parttime body, and though Branscomb has professional acquaintanceships with several of the people who served on Reagan's Science and Technology Task Force, that group was dissolved prior to Inauguration Day, and its members, mostly from high-tech industries, went back to their regular jobs. The science administrators whose budgets are being hacked up all have something to say, but for the moment they don't know who to say it to.

As for the National Institutes of Health, it, of

(Continued on page 3)

Conference on R&D Mobility

A meeting on International Mobility of Scientists and Engineers will be held in Lisbon next June under the sponsorship of the US National Academy of Sciences, the NATO Science Committee and the European Science Foundation.

The meeting, comprising about 40 invitees, will examine the generally held impression that there's been a decline in recent years in the numbers of scientists and engineers who log some time working abroad. Among the items to be discussed are whether this is true, and, if so, does it matter.

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1981

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Anne Roark, Clive Cookson (Washington); Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $118.50 (two years, $198.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

New Head for House Science Subcommittee

Doug Walgren, a 40-year-old lawyer who represents a district in Pittsburgh, has been chosen to succeed Rep. George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.) as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology.

The chairmanship, vacated when Brown moved to another on the Agriculture Committee (SGR Vol. XI, No. 2), is the focal point for science-policy deliberations in the House. Its far-ranging jurisdiction—over laws, but not appropriations—specifically includes the White House science office, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Technology Assessment, the National Bureau of Standards, and, under a general mandate, just about anything even remotely associated with research, technology, and science education. The Subcommittee comes under the Science and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla.) In the legislative pecking order, the Committee ranked high when the biggest item in its jurisdiction, NASA, was booming, but since space went into a slump, the Committee hasn't been considered an especially good assignment.

Walgren, a third termer, has a bit of relevant pre-Congressional background for his new responsibility, having served from 1973-75 as corporate counsel of Behavioral Research Laboratories, Inc., Palo Alto.

Because of the unusually heavy election toll last November, plus voluntary moves to other committees, all the Science and Technology subcommittees have new chairmen. The others in the new lineup are as follows:

Energy Development and Applications: Fuqua

Natural Resources and Environment: James H. Scheuer (D-NY).

Energy Research and Production: Marilyn L. Bouquard (D-Tenn.)

Space Science and Applications: Ronnie G. Flippo (D-Ala.)

Transportation, Aviation, and Materials: Dan Glickman (D-Kan.)

Investigations and Oversight: Albert A. Gore Jr.

BUDGET *(Continued from page 2)*

course, is the premier institution for eluding Presidential roadblocks and proceeding directly to the Treasury—via Congress. The game, however, is a bit more difficult this year, for an old ally in that gambit, former Senator Richard S. Schweiker, is now Secretary of the parent Department of Health and Human Services. He knows the plays at least as well as the NIH brass, and though Stockman has not yet said anything publicly about rations for the Bethesda complex, he surely must have noticed that the Carter budget holds NIH to a small helping of growth in anticipation of Congress piling it on as usual.

The budgetary outlook for science is gloomy only if one takes the Stockmanites at face value and disregards the inevitable mobilization of resistance forces. For the academic and scientific organizations that infest Washington with fulltime, knowledgeable staffs of scouts and lobbyists, the oncoming clash over money is just another inning in a never-ending contest.

The news is dominated by leaks of impending cataclysms and repeated assurances that this time it's for real. No doubt there will be victims. But it's doubtful that the rumored hit list and the eventual casualty list will bear much resemblance, in research, or, for that matter, in many other parts of the federal budget.—DSG

TI's Bucy Assails '80s Report

Still more haggling over the report of the President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties, this time in the form of a dissent from J. Fred Bucy Jr., President of Texas Instruments, who was on the Commission's five-member Panel on Science and Technology.

His beef is that the 93-page report of the panel, which was summarized in the full report of the Commission (SGR Vol. XI, No. 2), is somewhat short of reverence for high-technology. Coming from the chief of TI, this is expectable. But Bucy then goes on to complain about what everyone associated with the Agenda exercise knows to be so, but of which little has been publicly discussed: namely, that the great study exercise that Jimmy Carter put in motion was actually conducted in a haphazard, hurried fashion. Says Bucy:

"One of the most compelling reasons for this dissenting viewpoint is the failure of the Panel to reach agreement through debate. In this regard, the problem of the Panel may well be a microcosm of the problem facing the nation at large. In this Panel, as well as in many other Panels of the Commission, we faced constraints of time, resources, and availability of Commissioners as we addressed a virtual maze of problems—complex both in fact and in value. The views of Commissioners were assessed individually, with an attempt to reach our common statement by incorporating our

(Continued on page 4)

Sen. Stevens Elected to Head OTA Board

The often-quarrelsome Congressional Board of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) held its first meeting of the 97th Congress last week and seemed to be in an unusually harmonious mood.

With the chairmanship rotated to the Senate this time, Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) got the job, succeeding Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.), who replaced Stevens as Vice Chairman. New members on the Board are Senator Howard W. Cannon (D-Nev.), taking the place of the retired Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill.), and Rep. Cooper Evans (R-Iowa), who succeeds another dropout, Rep. John W. Wydler (R-NY).

The remaining holdovers from the last Congress are: Senators Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Ernest Hollings (D-SC), Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), and Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.); also, Reps. George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.), John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), Larry Winn Jr. (R-Kans.), and Clarence E. Miller (R-Ohio).

The Board, which is supposed to have final say on the OTA agenda of studies, showed a sensitivity to turf protection by expressing concern about several instances in which an OTA study was commanded by Congress through inclusion in a statute. In one case, OTA was ordered to review the research design that the Veterans Administration would use for a study of the health effects of Agent Orange; in another, it was directed to study the leasing of federally owned coal-bearing lands. The OTA Board members informally agreed that they didn't care for this usurpation of their authority, especially since it cuts into the OTA budget, whose growth has been a sorepoint in past years. The members said they'd talk up the issue with their colleagues, including the possibility of requiring committees to finance desired studies that don't fit into the OTA agenda.

What's evident from a list of studies to be completed by OTA during the next few months is that the organization has achieved a high rate of production. Following is the list:

Coming OTA Reports

SOLAR POWER SATELLITE SYSTEMS: Analysis of key technical and social issues that would affect the possible future development of solar power satellites as a potential long-term energy option.

ANALYSIS OF NUCLEAR POWERPLANT STANDARDIZATION PROBLEMS: Examines the feasibility of standardizing the design and manufacture of nuclear power plants to improve their safety and licensibility.

DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION POTENTIAL OF FEDERAL COAL LEASES: As mandated by the Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act (Public Law 94-377), analyzes all outstanding Federal coal development rights, which includes 533 developed and undeveloped leases and 172 preference-right lease applications.

US INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS: A COMPARISON OF STEEL, ELECTRONICS AND AUTOMOBILES: Evaluates three U.S. industries in terms of their international competitiveness as indicated by import penetration, productivity, and return on assets.

TECHNOLOGIES FOR DETERMINING CANCER RISKS FROM THE ENVIRONMENT: Examines the various estimates of cancer caused by the environment, the methods of identifying chemical carcinogen and to protect human risk, and the elements involved in deciding that a carcinogen poses an unreasonable risk to human health.

IMPACTS OF APPLIED GENETICS: Studies the benefits; costs; and environmental, legal and ethical issues that arise from the introduction of nonhuman applications of genetic technologies in agriculture and industry.

TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS: Weighs whether Federal regulatory policies encourage or discourage private innovation in the achievement of health, safety, and environmental and economic goals.

FRESHWATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, PLANNING AND POLICY: AN ASSESSMENT OF MODELS AND PREDICTIVE METHODS: Evaluates the wide range of computer models and methods used to predict the work of water resource projects and regulations.

OCEAN RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY: Identifies the most effective technologies and management systems in researching important ocean-related phenomena.

IMPACT OF ADVANCED AIR TRANSPORT TECHNOLOGY: Explores the impacts of introducing or not introducing second-generation SST's into our commercial fleet (including financing and management alternatives) and the likely futures of low density (commuter) air service and air cargo operations.

SOCIETAL IMPACT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY: Reviews the entire technology base and structure of the telecommunications industry and sketches a range of future policy options and their likely implications.

BUCY *(Continued from page 3)*

comments into a draft text circulated by the staff.

"The Commissioners in the Panel never fully debated the relative importance of issues or the balance among the issues. Nor did we determine which issues should be given priority on the agenda for the 1980s. Therefore, the report, as written, does not carry the collective judgment on these key questions. The report is not a document that stands alone and upon which the President can base his decisionmaking agenda for the eighties."

What that translates to is that the purported report of the Panel is mainly the product of a staff that had to do a catch-as-catch-can job of collecting, distilling, and harmonizing the views of a bunch of over-commited celebrities who agreed to serve as Commissioners.

Ex-Aide Says Science, White House Don't Mix

Ever since its Sputnik-inspired founding, insider memoirs of the White House science office have been dominated by celebratory tales of how we wise scientists benefically influenced political and public policy. There's now an important exception, provided by a certified ex-insider, Edward J. Burger, a Harvard physician-researcher who joined the Office of Science and Technology in 1969 and served with it, and its successor organization, until 1976. In a newly published book, "Science at the White House: A Political Liability" (Johns Hopkins University Press, 180 pages, $14.95), Burger basically argues that national politics and longrange scientific advice within government have proven incompatible. (Burger now teaches and consults in Washington.) Following are excerpts:

●

. . .the liaison between science (and scientists) and the public policy machinery at the corporate level of the government is a difficult and tenuous one at best—in any era. . .The reasons are to be found in certain intrinsic differences between how scientists think about national matters and the incentives which operate so strongly on politicians.

There is no need to invoke a conspiratorial theory to explain this point. There are simply important differences between the outlooks of those who assume political leadership and those who are trained in and dedicated to the rigors of science. . .In my view. . . the differences separating scientists and government have become sharper in recent years—principally because of changes in the pattern of government in recent years as a by-product of public demands for greater accountability. . .

Science for policy making is the application of scientific and technical information, of scientists' judgments and, perhaps, of some of the methods of science to decisions about government programs and policies—especially for those. . .that have clear scientific and technical components. . .My judgment is that, while this (science for policy) function is of undeniable importance, its execution—particularly for nonmilitary and nonsecurity issues—is rendered difficult by the very processes of democratic government as we know them. In fact, the better the job done by a science adviser, the more skill that is used in his analysis and advice, the more hazardous is the process for the adviser. The adviser who proceeds as a scientifically oriented man (or even a logical man) is by definition likely to find himself in waters dangerously close to the processes known as governmental planning—a concept that is not well received by the electorate. . .

Those trained in the rigors of scientific investigation. . .are steeped in the practices and philosophy of objective and analytic thinking. What scientists can bring to office of a presidential counselor is analytic thinking, careful sorting of alternatives, quantitative comparisons, and evaluation combined with an eye toward future trends. It is these very aspects, in fact, that nominally have been included in the charters granted to the Office of the Science Adviser. Yet, as logical as this matter appears on the surface, in practice, to the extent that these activities resemble planning in areas such as health, energy, education, housing or transportation, they are not necessarily well received by an electorate whose own interests may be threatened. Explicit analysis and planning for domestic issues cut across the grain of traditional consensus building and may at times be looked upon as actually interfering with the public policy process. . .

The experience to date shows that as the processes of systematic analysis and prediction get better and better, they become correspondingly less and less politically attractive. . .

The major tasks of analysis and study for policy-making (and especially for "forward thinking") in domestic matters may well have to be performed not within but outside the structures of government. . . Such a conclusion calls for the marshalling of the best intellectual resources into private or quasi-public aggregations created and dedicated precisely for the purpose.

Burger supports his dour thesis with examples drawn from his own White House science advisory experiences in dealing with several major health-related issues. These include the cost-effectiveness of health expenditures, the funding of biomedical research, environmental hazards, family planning, and ill-fated efforts to produce a comprehensive report on science and technology. In all the cases Burger cites, he records the ups and downs of getting political recognition for scientific advice—mostly downs. In the case of the blockbuster scientific report, he states that after "seemingly endless drafts," its 450 typewritten pages were still considered unpublishable.

"When the report dealt frankly and in any depth with matters of real substance and real scientific importance, it inevitably touched on matters that were threatening and too hot to handle for political operatives. When the report stepped back from its goal of having anything of real substance to say about scientific and technical contributions to an issue, the resulting text was inevitably bland and had nothing new to contribute."

A Gentle Hand at Helm in Education Dept.

"My style has always been to seek consensus and avoid confrontation," said Terrel H. Bell, the Reagan Administration's choice for Secretary of Education, at his Senate confirmation hearing.

That self-characterization is accurate, according to several of the Washington-based college and university lobbyists who saw Bell in action in the now-defunct post of US Commissioner of Education from 1974-76 and have studied his record as Commissioner of Higher Education in Utah since then. And it gives them mixed feelings about his selection to head a department that President Reagan says he'll abolish.

Educators are relieved, of course, that Reagan did not chose a right-wing zealot to head the Education Department (ED). Tel Bell, as he is known, is a moderately conservative pragmatist with an unbroken career in education since earning his first degree at Albion State Normal College, Idaho, after World War II. (As a high school teacher, he taught chemistry and physics.) Bell is given good marks for the way he has coped with budget cuts for state colleges and universities in his most recent job, and he probably understands the problems and preoccupations of American higher education as well as anyone in the country.

The doubts about Bell's appointment are centered on his much-advertised eagerness to compromise. Will he be willing to stand up firmly against the pressures that ED will certainly experience from other members of the Reagan Administration? Too early to tell—though some observers maintain that Bell was actually quite effective in his low-key way in heading off the Nixon and Ford administrations' attacks on federal education programs. Others disagree.

Bell appears already to have modified his views about the position of education in the federal government. Two years ago he testified enthusiastically in favor of legislation supported by the Carter Administration to set up the cabinet-level Education Department. But Bell said at his confirmation hearing on January 15 that when Reagan interviewed him before his cabinet nomination, "I was told very forthrightly that the President-elect is on record for abolishing that department." Bell told the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee: "One of the responsibilities I will have will be to look for other alternatives" to ED. "The President intends to carry out the commitments he made during the campaign."

At the press conference announcing Bell's appointment, White House Press Secretary James Brady gave the impression that his boss regarded the new Education Secretary as pliable material. As *Newsweek* put it, "Brady declared that the new secretary 'will agree with the president-elect's policy on the future of the department, no matter what it turns out to be.' "

Bell has indicated in interviews and at his confirmation hearing that he would oppose a move to push education back into a bureaucracy like the old Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). He told the Senate hearing that his support for the creation of ED "grew out of the frustration I had as Education Commissioner in the huge structure of HEW. There were times when I felt I was the lowest form of life."

Bell, a 59-year-old Mormon, would apparently be happier if ED keeps its independent status but loses its cabinet rank and is downgraded into an agency on a par with NASA or the National Science Foundation. That prospect alarms some educators who fear that

(Continued on page 7)

"Soft Science" Societies Huddle for Warmth in Washington

Eight organizations representing what's usually referred to as the "soft sciences" have teamed up to join the long list of learned societies that have established Washington outposts to secure their share of goodies from federal grantors and policymakers.

The newcomer, which got itself together at a meeting in Chicago in December, is called the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, and is made up of the following charter organizations (with more due to sign on after they hold their annual meetings):

American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Conference on the Use of On-Line Computers in Psychology, Cognitive Science Society, Psychonomic Society, Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Society for Mathematical Psychology, and Society for Psychophysiological Research.

According to an announcement from the 50,000-member American Psychological Association, which is the largest of the constituent organizations, the Federation plans to open a Washington office in 1982. Among the aims stated in the Federation's charter are: "To educate the public, and private and public agencies on the need for basic research on behavior and cognition." Also: "To encourage legislation and policy that enhances training and research in basic and behavioral, psychological, psychobiological and cognitive processes."

Membership will be by societies, rather than on an individual basis. The President of the Federation is George Mandler, of the Center for Human Information Processing, University of California, San Diego.

. . .Does Cabinet Status Make A Difference?

(Continued from page 6

without a cabinet secretary to speak out for them, federal education programs will be even more vulnerable to the Reaganite axe.

Others believe that having cabinet status is virtually irrelevent. Higher education lobbyists should not invest political capital in the defense of ED, they say—far better to use their resources to stave off attacks on its specific programs. According to this argument, what really matters is the political priority attached to a field: If the national mood is against you, a seat at the cabinet table is no defense; if, on the other hand, the tide is running in your favor, the funds will pour in, whatever your rank—as NASA demonstrated in the 1960s.

Terrel Bell was formally sworn in as Education Secretary on January 23, the day after the Senate confirmed his nomination, 90-2, with Senators William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) and Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.) casting the nays. How long he remains in the cabinet is likely to depend as much as anything on how the Senate's Republican leadership responds to the prospect of downgrading or dismantling ED. Many Republicans voted for the legislation that created the department in 1979—it passed by a 69-22 margin in the Senate—and while several have changed their minds since, others apparently feel ED should be given at least a couple of years to prove itself in action before they consider another disruptive reorganization of federal education programs.

However, support for the idea of converting ED to an independent education agency is growing. For example, Senator Harrison Schmitt (R-NM) endorsed that solution at the opening meeting of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, of which he's the new chairman. He also took the opportunity to call for more federal support for science and engineering education. So it may not be cuts all around.—CC

Academy Makes Big Awards

The National Academy of Sciences has issued its annual list of big-buck awards for scientific achievements, including a new one, for $15,000, provided by Bell Labs in honor of its retired chairman, William O. Baker. Presentations will be made April 28, at the regular spring meeting. Recipients and prizes are:

Thomas M. Donahue, University of Michigan, Arctowski Medal Medal ($5,000) for atmospheric chemistry studies of earth, Mars, and Venus.

Shing-Tung Yau, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, John J. Carty Medal ($5,000) for mathematical theory applications.

Gerald J. Wasserburg, Caltech, Arthur L. Day Prize and Lectureship ($10,000), for application of isotopes to geophysical solar studies.

Philip Leder, Harvard, Richard Lounsbery Award for Biology and Medicine ($50,000), for contributions to molecular genetics.

John S. Chipman, University of Minnesota, James Murray Luck Award ($5,000), for contribution to economic theory on international trade, welfare economics, and other areas.

Bruno Zimm, UC San Diego, NAS Award in the Chemical Sciences ($5,000), for research in polymer and other fields of chemistry.

Gary D. Patterson, Bell Labs, NAS Award for Initiative in Research, honoring William O. Baker ($15,000), for contribution to polymer science.

Stanley Cohen, Vanderbilt University, Robertson Memorial Lecture ($2500), for cancer research on epidermal growth factor.

Ronald Davis, Stanford, and Gerald D. Fink, Cornell, US Steel Foundation Award in Molecular Biology ($5,000 each), for contributions to genetic analysis.

In the above cases, the Academy serves as administrator and judge of the awards, with prizes furnished by outside organizations or individuals.

The Academy's own award, the NAS Public Welfare Medal, will be presented to Russell E. Train, President of the World Wildlife Fund—US and former head of the Environmental Protection Agency. Train's prize is limited to a medal.

NSF Supports Computer Net

The National Science Foundation is providing up to $5 million for a 5-year program to develop a nationwide computer-based communications network to serve computer-science research groups in universities, industry, and government. NSF's Division of Mathematical and Computer Sciences will manage the project pending formation of a special center for development and operations. Initial participants are the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of Delaware, Purdue University, the University of Utah, and the Rand Corporation.

Ex-EPA Chief at Harvard

Douglas M. Costle, head of the Environmental Protection Agency throughout the Carter Administration, has received a February to July appointment as Visiting Scholar at the Harvard School of Public Health. An announcement from the School says Costle will participate in an ongoing risk-assessment study, participate in courses, and assist in an examination of the curriculum on environmental policy.

In Print

Background Readings on Science, Technology and Energy R&D in Japan and China, 499 pages, a collection assembled for, and available without charge from: House Committee on Science and Technology, Room 2319 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

Transition Takes Toll at Geological Survey

The Reagan broom has swept across the traditionally non-political directorship of the US Geological Survey, and the deposed chief, H. William Menard, is a bit angry about the way he's been treated, both by the outgoing and incoming presidents.

What happened was that, post-election, Carter pledged close cooperation with the incoming Administration, and, in line with that pledge requested resignations from all presidential appointees to clear the way for Reagan.

For Menard, this request raised a delicate problem, because by ancient tradition, the Survey, part of the Interior Department, has been considered a non-political agency whose chiefs carry on from one administration to the next. This tradition is not wholly intact, since Menard himself was summoned to the job after his predecessor was forced out by then-Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus six months after the Carter Administration took office. But that shift could be written off as a personnel adjustment, rather than a politically flavored, change-of-administration purge.

In any case, mindful of the Survey's tradition for being shielded from political fire, Menard, after consultation with two predecessors in the directorship, responded, not with a resignation but an offer to resign, if the President so desired. The past Survey directors told Menard that that's what they had done, and, happily, had got no replies.

So, Menard sent off his offer. To his astonishment, Carter accepted it, stating that the date of departure would be set later. However, when Carter left the presidency, Menard was still there, having resigned to a now-gone President, and never having got a departure date for himself.

It wasn't long in coming, however. Around noon on January 26, a member of the new Secretary's staff told Menard that he was out "as of the close of business that day," in Menard's recollection of the conversation.

Menard, who's never been politically active—he declined when asked if he'd take part in Carter's re-election campaign—is on leave from the University of California. He says he'll stay in Washington for a time as a researcher with the Survey and then return to UC.

The customary, though not statutory, process for filling the directorship calls for the Secretary of the Interior to make a selection from a list submitted by the National Academy of Sciences, whose services were promptly solicited by Secretary James G. Watt, along with a flock of geo-societies. The Secretary then passes the choice to the President, who submits the nomination to the Senate.

There's been speculation that if Carter hadn't ordered up that resignation, the Survey chief might have passed unnoticed by the new Administration. But that now seems unlikely, given that Watt made a nearly complete sweepout of the Department's agency chiefs, among them Lynn A. Greenwalt, for the past eight years head of the Fish and Wildlife Service, a post that has traditionally been exempted from transitional changes.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106